DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 801 SP 022 680

AUTHOR Scannell, Dale P.; And Others
TITLE A Proposed Accreditation System (An Alternative to the Current NCATE System).
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 83
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; Educational Change; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; *Institutional Evaluation; Organizational Effectiveness; Policy Formation; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Proposals; *Schools of Education; Standards; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ; *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

A proposal to develop an alternative to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation process is designed to overcome deficiencies in the existing system. The proposal includes a rationale and design for the new system, a discussion of the governance and participation problem, and a timeline and process for adoption and implementation. Major elements of change included in the proposal are: (1) Accreditation decisions are made for the teacher education unit, not for individual programs or categories; (2) Continuing accreditation replaces the current concept of re-accreditation; (3) Articulation is provided between state approval and national accreditation; (4) Visiting team members are selected from a Board of Examiners, members of which are highly skilled in evaluation techniques and well-trained in NCATE processes and standards; (5) Five unit-focused standards replace the current six families for basic and advanced programs; and (6) The NCATE Annual List is expanded to include a description of the unit and data which describe the support level for professional education programs. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231801

A PROPOSED ACCREDITATION SYSTEM

(An Alternative to the Current NCATE System)

Prepared by

AACTE's Committee on Accreditation Alternatives

Dale P. Scannell, University of Kansas, Chairperson
William E. Gardner, University of Minnesota
Hans C. Olsen, University of Houston at Clear Lake City
Cathy Sullivan, Representative of the National Education Association
Richard Wisniewski, University of Oklahoma

DRAFT

January 1983

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Washington, D.C.

SP022680

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Pomeroy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

I. Introduction....1

II. Background: Concerns About NCATE....4

III. Accreditation Within the Context of Teacher Education Unit Accountability Requirements....12

IV. The Proposal....15

A. Accreditation Focus: The Professional Education Unit....16

B. The Standards....17

C. Board of Examiners and Visiting Teams....23

D. The Accreditation Process....25

1. Seeking Accreditation....26
2. Annual Monitoring and Review....28

E. Council Decision-Making Process....30

F. Proposal Implementation/Quantification of Standards....31

V. Proposal Development Process and Relation to Other Position Statements....33

VI. Proposal Implications....37

A. Financial....38
B. Organization and Governance....41
C. NCATE Staff....43

VII. Appendices....44

A. Applying for Accreditation and Preconditions....45
B. Examples of Data Elements....50

I.

INTRODUCTION

This proposal was developed by the Committee on Accreditation Alternatives (CAA), appointed in November, 1981 by the President of AACTE on behalf of its Board of Directors. Although the proposal results from an AACTE initiative, the National Education Association (NEA) has been involved through inclusion of an NEA representative as a member of the Committee during the past year.

The charge of AACTE's Board of Directors, to which the CAA responded, was "to develop an alternative accreditation process" designed to "overcome the deficiencies of the existing system." More specifically, the Board asked for a proposal which would include a rationale and design for the new system, a discussion of the governance and participation problem and a timeline and process for the adoption and implementation of the new system. It was left to the Committee whether to recommend that the proposed alternative should replace NCATE or should instead be seen as an organizational/process model designed to modify but not replace the existing system.

The current document is the fifth draft prepared by the Committee and distributed to stakeholders for reactions and suggestions. The initial draft was considered by the Board and discussed in a session at the February, 1982 Annual Meeting. The second draft was prepared for consideration by the Board and State ACTE leaders in June, 1982. The third and fourth drafts were distributed to various institutional constituencies, the NCATE Council and Coordinating Board, the AACTE Accreditation Task Force and Board of Directors.

The current draft will be considered by the AACTE Board of Directors in February, 1983 and distributed to institutional representatives for discussion at the Annual Meeting. The Board will consider the CAA recommendation that the proposed system be presented to the NCATE Council in March for adoption.

Primary Features of the Proposal

The system proposed by the Committee represents a dramatic change from the current NCATE process. It responds to the commitment of higher education institutions to self-regulation and to the pervasive concerns expressed by institutions and other stakeholders about the current process. The major elements of change included in this proposal are:

- o accreditation decisions are made for the teacher education unit, not for individual programs or categories;
- o continuing accreditation replaces the current concept of re-accreditation;
- o articulation is provided between state approval and national accreditation;
- o visiting team members are selected from a Board of Examiners, members of which are highly skilled in evaluation techniques and well-trained in NCATE processes and standards;
- o five unit-focused standards replace the current six families for basic and advanced programs; and
- o the NCATE Annual List is expanded to include a description of the unit and data which describe the support level for professional education programs.

II.

BACKGROUND:

CONCERNS ABOUT NCATE

CONCERNS ABOUT NCATE

In developing the charge to the CAA, AACTE's Board of Directors was responding to a number of comments and concerns which had arisen about national accreditation in teacher education. Initially, the CAA reviewed and analyzed actions taken by various groups in the past several years which we believe reflect the widespread nature and serious character of the concerns.

In 1976 the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (ACSESULGC) reported the results of a survey of its membership which highlighted several major criticisms of the NCATE process. A special committee was formed by the organization to review fundamental issues involved in national accreditation and to make recommendations to the membership as to what position should be adopted regarding NCATE. A study was undertaken by that committee and an extensive report prepared. On the basis of that report, the Association recommended that its members remain in NCATE for a period of five years and, in the event that efforts to reform NCATE did not succeed, a new voluntary national accrediting association be established for the Land Grant institutions.

This "wait and see" attitude reflected the organization's belief that NCATE was making efforts to revamp and reform its operation. A major evaluation study had been proposed and was being considered by the NCATE Council (Wheeler Report). NCATE had begun an analysis of its internal operations designed to identify and address major difficulties. Time was needed to see if these efforts would have beneficial results. The Association is scheduled to decide in February, 1983 on future participation in NCATE.

In 1980 the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU) conducted a survey to determine the degree to which its membership considered NCATE standards to be adequate, the level of support for the process among TECSCU members, and their opinions on voluntary versus mandatory accreditation. Subsequently, TECSCU made several sweeping recommendations in a resolution which passed its membership unanimously. This resolution stated TECSCU's strong support for the accreditation process as one of the quality controls in teacher education, stated its belief that accreditation should be mandatory and identified the role of national accreditation to be one which would monitor and report the extent to which states enforce compliance with national standards for accreditation.

Additional concern is manifest among other institutions of higher education (IHEs) reflected by the decisions of several Wisconsin institutions to withdraw from NCATE and the decision of other state systems to assess the value of NCATE and, presumably, to decide whether further participation is warranted. In September, 1982 a document proposing a Wisconsin consortium for improving professional education preparation programs was released as an alternative to NCATE.

During the past several years some of the participating organizations have questioned the extent of their participation in the NCATE process. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) withdrew, while representatives of specialty groups (such as the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)) expressed concern that NCATE standards were

not specific to the characteristics and/or abilities needed in their fields. At least one of the original constituent members is considering withdrawal from NCATE because of problems with dues and a general lack of support for the process.

Within NCATE itself, considerable concern has been expressed over the organization and management of the enterprise. A proposal addressing a substantial "redesign" of NCATE was developed by the NCATE staff in late 1981. The goals of that proposal were to organize NCATE more effectively, finance the organization to be less dependent on the fortunes of its constituents and manage the Council in a more effective fashion.

The study conducted under the auspices of the Michigan State University Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT) by Chris Wheeler pointed to some weaknesses and inconsistencies in the NCATE process and in Council decisions. The major recommendations made by Wheeler were that the standards be revised, a policy manual be developed to explain the rationale for the standards, the analysis of institutions be conducted on an indepth basis and training for teams be greatly improved.

Comments in these surveys, statements and redesign proposals range broadly across NCATE actions and identify a variety of problems and issues. At the risk of some oversimplification, we believe the following statements correctly identify the major concerns.

Clarity of Standards

Fundamental to the success and integrity of the NCATE process is a clear and unambiguous set of standards which can be uniformly applied. As a group, the current standards are perhaps more accurately described as broad goal statements which outline desirable directions for teacher education or encourage new emphases, rather than hard, fast quantifiable standards. Such broad statements may be acceptable to institutions when the accreditation task is basically developmental (that is, when it seeks to help an institution identify weaknesses and improve its teacher education programs) but become less so when regulation is the goal.

Appropriateness of Standards

It is also the case that the standards should focus on those elements most closely identified with quality in teacher education. All of the NCATE standards do not fit this mold. Some are more like preconditions for an accreditation visit than standards. The governance standard, for example, deals with an important issue--the arrangements made by an institution for control of the process of teacher education. A school, college or department of education (SCDE), however, might well be expected to demonstrate before a visit occurs that its structure for governance meets requirements. Other standards are completely process oriented; for example, the standard on admission, retention and advising of students seems to advocate only that a process exists for each of these functions--it does not set standards for admission and retention which are associated with effective graduates. Further, all of the present standards may not be appropriate to the various levels and types of programs or categories for which accreditation is awarded. Why, for example, are <u>two</u> governance standards, basic and advanced, needed?

Finally, as extensive as they are, the present standards ignore factors usually considered essential to determine the quality of a teacher preparation program (for example, student-faculty ratios or other indicators of how the resource base is deployed; extensive clinical training, and so on).

Visiting Team Composition and Size

There is considerable concern over the composition, size and training of the visiting teams. Most teams include some members on a first visit, and even though training is common, consistent understandings and application are difficult where standards are subject to varying interpretation. Institutions frequently question whether team member backgrounds are appropriate or sufficient for the types and levels of programs being reviewed. Quite frequently teams appear to lack an understanding of the type of institution they visit. Teams are quite large (the 1981 average size was 9) and are not socialized as a unit prior to arrival on the campus for a visit.

Furthermore, visiting team members are selected as much for the organizations they represent as for their knowledge and skill. This process of selection leads to interested and reasonably objective team members who, unfortunately, have not had systematic, indepth training and who have not had the opportunity to practice their evaluation skills more than once per year. These difficulties create serious questions about the relationship between team observations and Council judgments and lead to the claim that the process contains serious flaws leading to a lack of reliability in the evaluation system.

Redundancy of Program and Institutional Reviews

National specialized accreditation is a voluntary form of self-regulation unique to American education. However, in addition to voluntary participation in accreditation, teacher education is subject to reviews by a variety of other controlling agencies, such as those required for institutional self-evaluation and state agency program approval. Thus, national accreditation must be sufficiently unique and important to sustain acceptability and support within institutions and among professional and governmental agencies and to justify the cost and effort associated with the process.

State agencies have the legal right for both institutional and program approval in teacher education. In the last decade, state education agencies (SEAs) and the various teacher commissions have moved aggressively to upgrade their efforts in institutional and program approval. NCATE has not refined its focus and activities as rapidly as state agencies have, and, as a result, considerable redundancy exists in the two types of reviews.

Categorical Review Weakness

At the present time NCATE uses the term "programs" to refer to what are really "categories" of programs. Subsuming institutional programs to fit those categories is very often difficult. More importantly, at times very good or very poor programs--in English education or social studies education, for example--are masked by the categories or unrealistically branded as good or bad because they are grouped with the other programs in NCATE's broad categories.

Further, even though there is public disclosure of the entire set of NCATE decisions, even one denial is frequently interpreted by the public, and sometimes within the affected institution, as a failure for the entire education unit. Explanations are not powerful enough to remove the cloud from the unit, and units that are in the main viable have to face public, campus and professional approbation. This has led some institutions to conclude that there is much to be lost by seeking NCATE accreditation.

Excessive Cost

There is considerable concern among institutions over the costs incurred by an NCATE visit. To stay accredited, an institution must pay a basic fee to NCATE of $300 and a supplementary fee for each program accredited. The average annual dues for NCATE membership are approximately $350. In addition, institutions support NCATE through the dues paid to AACTE (or through payment of sustaining fees to NCATE); AACTE in turn, provides basic support of $65,000 annually for NCATE. Further, the institution is responsible for all of the costs of a team visit; such costs currently average approximately $5,500 and range from $4,500 to $9,000, depending on the size of the team and the distance its members must travel. In addition, there is the cost of faculty and administrative time in preparing a self-survey and the printing costs associated with the institution report.

Compared with other accrediting agencies, such costs are not staggering. One must bear in mind, though, that institutions frequently have like costs associated with state visits to their campus, and state approval must be a priority concern in order to maintain teacher education programs. In such circumstances even the modest costs of NCATE appear to be very high to some of its clients.

Distinction Between Initial and Re-accreditation

Another concern with the current NCATE process is that it does not distinguish between an institution which has achieved accreditation and one which has not in terms of the nature of the materials prepared, scope of the team's visit, the standards and criteria applied, and so on. Many people in teacher education believe that it should be possible to differentiate these processes, which would lead to economies of scale and cost.

Unclear Goals for Accreditation

NCATE may also suffer from a lack of clear purpose. Traditionally, accreditation has been expected to contribute to the purposes of stimulation for improvement within institutions as well as providing quality control for regulation. Many concerned supporters, as well as critics, of NCATE believe that regulation has been stressed at the expense of stimulation by emphasizing achievement of minimal standards for accreditation purposes.

Procedural Problems

Many of the basic concerns and problems with NCATE flow from the sheer size and complexity of the task faced by the Council. Of the approximately 1350 SCDEs in the United States, 536 are accredited by NCATE. Although a minority (40 percent) of the total is accredited by NCATE, the number is

several times larger than comparable specialized accrediting agencies. Each of the institutions accredited by NCATE is now on a seven-year cycle with either a full or mini-visit occuring every five years. Thus, each year approximately 107 institutions must be visited by NCATE teams. This number, of course, is increased by the fact that institutions will request accreditation for new programs or for subsets of their programs (for example, new graduate emphases) on an "off-cycle" basis.

Additional Concerns

A variety of additional concerns should be mentioned. Complaints have been made about the inability of the Council to rate the importance of different standards, even though many people firmly believe that standards do differ in their importance to a favorable Council decision. Some institutions believe that the Council acts in a heavy-handed way; some believe the operation is closed, that participation is limited; some claim that decisions are biased in favor of small or single-purpose institutions while others claim that the bias favors large, multipurpose institutions; this last point reflects what may be a general lack of trust or confidence in the system.

Conclusion

The magnitude of concern among institutions of higher education and the erosion of confidence among other important groups about the usefulness and validity of teacher education accreditation provides the rationale for a careful review of the NCATE process. The current process has some important and desirable characteristics, not the least of which is the forum NCATE provides for the cooperation of teacher educators, practicing teachers, representatives of specialized professional groups and representatives of the general public. This proposal is based on an assumption that a modification of the process can be made without diminishing or eliminating the strengths of NCATE that have been developed through the years of diligent effort and professional commitment.

The concerns and criticisms that have been expressed about NCATE's present approach provide the impetus for considering change. Any proposed revision must, however, be developed with clear understanding of what national accreditation is and how it relates to other similar activities. An outline of external accountability requirements for the teacher education unit and their interrelated nature is addressed in the next section.

Synthesis of Concerns and Proposal Elements
Addressing Concerns

Concerns	Proposal Elements Addressing
1. Clarity of standards	Unit standards; data bank; identification of quantifiable indicators of quality.
2. Appropriateness of standa	Expanded pre-conditions; identification of, and process for determining, quantifiable indicators of quality; focus on professional education unit in place of category by degree level.
3. Visiting team composition and size	Board of examiners; selection and in-depth training for visiting team; reduced team size.
4. Redundancy of program and institutional reviews	Accreditation focus on professional education unit.
5. Categorical review weakness	Unit standards; focus on professional education unit.
6. Excessive cost	Reduction in team size; continuing accreditation.
7. Distinction between initial and re-accreditation	Accreditation and continuing accreditation; annual monitoring and review.

8. Unclear goals for accreditation	Expanded Annual List including factual data for the institution; identification of quantifiable indicators of quality. Articulation between national accreditation and state approval.
9. Procedural problems	Continuing accreditation eliminates need for full team visit after initial accreditation and allows for updating of initial Unit Report. Unit focus eliminates categorical review if new programs are added.
10. Unevenness in application of standards and bias toward types of institutions	Process for determining quantifiable indicators of quality; objective data reporting system.

III.

ACCREDITATION WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF TEACHER EDUCATION UNIT ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS

The Function of National Accreditation

In some countries a federal ministry of education provides control and regulation of education personnel preparation. In the United States national accreditation has developed as the mechanism for self-regulation of the preparation of teachers and other school personnel by the preparation institutions together with the practicing profession. This accreditation is designed to maintain standards and strengthen the quality and integrity of preparation institutions and programs. It serves many purposes:

- o it shows that national quality standards are met;
- o it demonstrates institutional and programmatic integrity;
- o it confers professional status;
- o it provides political leverage for support;
- o it furnishes protection against improper pressure;
- o it promotes continued improvement;
- o it gives a basis for certification;
- o it supplies consumers with information about institutional and programmatic quality;
- o it provides consistency and continuity across states.

The Relationship of Regional Accreditation and National Accreditation

Regional accreditation is quite familiar to central administrators and most faculty members on every college or university campus. This form of accreditation deals with institutions as entities, not with their separate programs or specialty units. Six such accreditation agencies exist, each with its own geographic area, its own set of standards, its own accreditation policies and its own approach to meeting its responsibilities.

In contrast, national accreditation concentrates on the unit and/or programs for professional school personnel within institutions. Only one accreditation agency, NCATE, has been recognized for this purpose in professional education by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) and the Department of Education. Its national and specialized scope ensures that throughout this country the same process, the same standards and the same evaluation procedures are used to determine accreditability in professional education.

Since regional accreditation focuses on institutional objectives, programs, financial resources, faculty and library, holding such accreditation is taken as assurance of an acceptable level of overall institutional quality. Thus regional accreditation is a precondition for NCATE review.

The Relationship Between State Program Approval and National Accreditation

State approval and national accreditation in professional education are related but quite separate functions. During recent years, however, they have become so similar in apparent purposes as well as in standards, processes, terminology and outcomes that many in professional education now seriously question the need for both. If indeed there is little practical difference between approval and accreditation, then the latter hardly justifies the time, effort and money it presently requires.

If, however, the distinguishing characteristics of approval and accreditation are clearly set forth and deliberately used as bases for a new approach to accreditation, that function can become a major force for new levels of quality in professional education.

State approval is a governmental activity which focuses on developing and maintaining standards that all professional education programs or preparation units in the state's institutions of higher education must meet in order for their graduates to be eligible for certification. It derives from the state's legal responsibility for education and its obligation to protect its citizens from inadequate professional programs and/or preparation units within colleges and universities. Its purpose is to ensure that those who are to be certified by the state have completed adequate preparation programs. The standards are, therefore, those the state sets as the minimum it will accept within its borders. Since the state education agency controls and conducts approval efforts, the standards and procedures used develop from, and are continuously shaped by, conditions and persons within the state.

Accreditation, on the other hand, concentrates on establishing and upholding national standards of excellence. Thus, the standards are those that identify a consistent and high level of quality across the fifty states.

Accreditation is entered into by preparation units within colleges and universities as a means of demonstrating and promoting educational quality, institutional integrity and professional commitment. It is governed and directed by an independent agency supported by, and responsible to, the preparation institutions and the practicing profession. Accreditation standards and procedures are established, revised and/or updated by a process which includes representatives of the stakeholder organizations in NCATE. Those standards reflect nationally accepted criteria based upon research and recognized professional "best practice." Thus, the fundamental distinction between approval and accreditation lies in their respective purposes. While approval is concerned with the maintenance of acceptable standards for operation within states, accreditation concentrates on upholding national quality standards.

Because of the difference in purpose between state program approval and accreditation, the latter should seek to exceed the expectations for state approval. For this reason, state approval is required in order for programs or units to be eligible to begin the accreditation process.

This proposal was developed after an analysis of the concerns related to the current NCATE process and the purpose of national accreditation as opposed to other forms of regulation. The next section outlines the recommendations which resulted from this review.

IV.

THE PROPOSAL

The proposal components described in this section include:

- o The accreditation focus on the professional education unit
- o Unit standards
- o Board of examiners and visiting teams
- o The accreditation process: accreditation and review
- o The Council's decision-making process
- o Implementation of the proposal

The following basic principles undergird the proposal:

- o NCATE is revised and strengthened, not replaced.
- o Emphasis is on stimulating, identifying and publicizing quality in professional education.
- o Full appropriate involvement of the stakeholders in professional education is ensured.
- o All institutions, regardless of size, scope, type and focus have an equal opportunity to meet the standards and handle the processes of NCATE.
- o The burden of proof rests on each institution to demonstrate that its professional education unit meets the quality standards of NCATE.
- o Identified concerns about the present NCATE approach are directly addressed.
- o Changes that can be effected within NCATE receive attention; alterations requiring related changes in agencies and approaches outside NCATE may be alluded to but receive little consideration, regardless of their merits.

ACCREDITATION FOCUS: THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

NCATE review and decision-making center on the quality of the institution's professional education unit. The unit's mission, structure, governance, operation, resources, faculty, students, programs, use of the professional knowledge base and relationship to the world of practice provide the focus for accreditation. NCATE concentrates on the demonstrated ability of the professional education unit to meet rigorous national standards for the operation and support of high quality programs for the preparation of teachers and school personnel.

The professional education unit is the school, college, department or other official academic structure within the institution which exercises direct control of policy related to, and implementation of, preparation programs for teachers and other school personnel. It has the authority and responsibility for setting and achieving professional education goals in the institution; establishing policies for governance, programs, student admission, continuation and graduation; designating responsibility for program decision-making in professional education;

gaining and using resources for professional education; and developing and maintaining appropriate linkages both within the institution and external to it. It is headed by a dean, director or chair who is officially designated to represent it and assigned authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation.

The unit definition used in this proposal encompasses those programs for which NCATE authority is currently recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) and the U.S. Secretary of Education. The unit herein described therefore has responsibility for programs for the initial preparation of teachers including five-year and MAT programs and all advanced programs beyond the baccalaureate level which are related to the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. While the professional education unit may have responsibility for programs and operations in addition to those for the preparation of school personnel, for example, the preparation of college teachers, NCATE accreditation activities focus on determining and recognizing the quality of the unit with regard to the preparation for school service. The others are not reviewed except as they impinge on the professional education function of the unit. Special note is made of the fact that while NCATE does review the professional preparation programs(s) for which the unit is responsible, that constitutes only one of several dimensions examined to determine the quality of the unit.

A fact of institutional life is the variability of quality both among programs offered by the institution and the elements of an academic unit. However, the existence of a program or an element that is not as strong as others does not necessarily mean that the unit is without quality. In the proposed system, though the unit would be the focus of the accreditation decision, weak areas will be cited after the team visit and Council action. The real impact of negative decisions will be greater than in the current system which can accredit some programs and deny others. Such decisions will clearly indicate that the institution should either remedy the weaknesses or withdraw from the field of professional education. With the focus of accreditation on the professional education unit, the Council no longer grants or denies accreditation of each category and level of program put forward by an institution. It simply decides whether the unit itself meets the established national quality standards and is accreditable. It can now accurately be said that the institution is or is not accredited by NCATE.

THE STANDARDS

Given the above description of the process for unit accreditation, current NCATE standards can be dramatically reduced in number. They can be both clarified and reduced by eliminating the overlap between basic and advanced categories. The use of sub-standards within each standard can also be eliminated. In their place, it is posited that five unit standards [illegible] a unit's overall strength.

A focus on the generic characteristics of teacher preparation institutions challenges a powerful tradition. The unit approach will assess the institutional context within which all programs operate. The proposed change could do much to make NCATE reviews far more helpful to institutions as well as to their programs.

While the five unit standards are outlined below with suggested evidence criteria, their description has been purposely left incomplete as the refinement of standards is the responsibility of the NCATE Council in keeping with normal procedures. The development of precise statements for these suggested unit standards can be profitably undertaken only if this proposal is adopted.

If these suggestions appear reasonable, then the laborious work of constructing the exact standards can begin. The suggested standards are intended to provide frameworks within which the basic strengths and weaknesses of an institution can be assessed, regardless of the number of programs offered or the relative standing of those programs. The fundamental goal is to determine the overall quality of the unit's efforts.

The five proposed standards are:

I. Operation and Resources of the Unit
II. Faculty Resources
III. The Student Body
IV. The Knowledge Base for Preparation Programs
V. Relationship to the World of Practice

Standard I - Operation of the Unit

This standard is predicated on much of the existing standard I and is in part directly concerned with the operationalization of the first five conditions for eligibility for an accreditation evaluation by NCATE (See Appendix for section on "Applying for Accreditation and Preconditions".) The unit for professional education must demonstrate that in practice its membership, functions and leadership, including its relationships to other campus units, actually operate as described in the documentation that shows it meets the preconditions. The unit needs to show that it has a faculty responsible for formulating curricula and for the selection, retention and promotion of its members. It will need to demonstrate an administrative structure appropriate to those ends, as well as a structure for selecting, retaining and graduating students.

Since fiscal and physical resources are inexorably linked to a unit's faculty, administration and organization, this standard will also require documentation of those resources. This standard can draw on material presently in Standard V, requesting evidence to establish the quality of library and media resources, and of the instructional and clinical facilities available for teacher education.

Fiscal support for the unit will be compared to state, regional and/or national norms. Funding for the unit will need to acknowledge the higher costs of clinical training programs, that is, the costs of supervision and other special facilities required by clinically-based programs. While a faculty-student ratio will not be specified, each institution will provide a rationale for its faculty-student ratio in the clincial aspects of its preparation program. The unit's ratio will be compared to other professional preparation programs, to unique facets of the program, to national norms and to norms advocated by professional associations.

This standard will also require evidence of the institution's policies and commitments to multicultural education and affirmative action principles, as well as to activities designed to make students aware of racism, ageism, sexism, handicapism and any other limitations on educational opportunity.

Suggested Sources of Evidence. Minutes of unit meetings; minutes of sub-unit (department, division, etc.) meetings; faculty rosters for programs (elementary, special education, etc.); descriptions of administrative actions; illustrations of the working relationship between the unit and other campus units; documentation that the method of allocating resources to and by the unit is clearly defined and understood; evidence that the unit is equitably funded in comparison with other units in the institution and to state, regional and national norms; description of administrative authority and responsibility within the unit for professional education resources; evidence that the unit has the necessary library and instructional media, resources and physical facilities to meet the needs of its programs and faculty.

Standard II - The Faculty

This standard will focus on the training and competence of the unit's core, part-time and adjunct faculty. The institution will need to demonstrate that it has sufficient faculty depth to offer its programs of professional preparation. Scholarly productivity, service to the profession and teaching expectations set by the institution will be assessed in meeting this standard. Fundamental questions to be addressed include the following: Does the unit have a sufficient number of faculty, both full- and part-time, to offer the programs for which the unit has responsibility? Factors such as teaching load, number of preparations normal for faculty members and the range of expertise required of each individual faculty member would be assessed. Are competent persons responsible for all aspects of the program? If advanced graduate students are utilized to teach certain courses or to engage in supervision, is a competent faculty person responsible for those activities? Is that person directing the work of the advanced graduate students? If school-based persons are involved in the program, how are they selected? How are they involved in the programs?

It is difficult to determine precisely how many persons are needed in any school, college or department to offer the programs for which the unit has responsibility. It is equally true, however, that a critical mass of faculty must be present for a sufficient depth of experience to be available to students. Those programs with only limited numbers of faculty directly responsible for the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel

will need to present compelling evidence that a depth of expertise exists. It is not in the profession's best interest to accredit units that do not have sufficent faculty depth.

Suggested Sources of Evidence. Data summary sheets for the unit's core, part-time and adjunct faculty; evidence that faculty members teach in their areas of preparation and that all programs have an adequate number of faculty well prepared to teach in them; documentation of institutional and unit load policies including clinical supervision, advisement, committee service and so on; evidence that load policies are adhered to; evidence that faculty members' work is supervised and that the supervision is based upon established policies of procedure and performance; criteria and processes for selection, evaluation, promotion, tenure and termination of faculty members; information about the unit's faculty demographics; documentation of the scholarly activity as well as service accomplishments of the faculty; appropriate information from faculty handbooks or other documents.

Standard III - The Students

The emphasis in this standard is on the admission standards of the unit and on its measure of student achievement at the end of its programs. The unit will need to demonstrate how it screens for the profession and the rationale for its admissions, retention and graduation standards. It will need to provide evidence of performance competencies at the end of its respective programs. It will need to relate its admissions processes to the profession's efforts to strengthen the quality of persons in the profession. The unit may need to analyze its standards in respect to state minimum standards of admission. Since national accreditation is designed to encourage units to meet the highest professional norms, comparisons between state minimums, the unit's efforts and national norms will be addressed.

If certain programs appear to have minimal enrollments, the unit will need to provide its rationale for maintaining those programs. If the unit limits enrollments to any of its programs, the impact of this factor on student quality will be assessed.

A major part of this standard focuses on evaluation activities conducted by the unit, for example, efforts to determine the quality of its graduates. The unit will need to demonstrate that a systematic process exists by which it assesses the quality of its programs and how this information is utilized by the unit in planning its work. This information includes, but is not limited to, employment statistics, student reactions to programs after graduation, internal or external evaluations of programs conducted apart from the NCATE process, input from employing officials and so on. The relationship of evaluation findings to the knowledge base implemented by the unit would also need to be addressed.

It is further proposed that the standard allow an enrollment flexibility factor for each unit. It is reasonable to assume that most units may on occasion wish to waive established admissions norms for special cases, experimental programs, or to address unique factors in the institution's enrollment profiles. The flexibility factor, however, must be documented so that the norms defined by the unit are not violated. The flexibility factor should not damage high standards of professional competence at the point of graduation.

Suggested Sources of Evidence. Criteria for admission, continuation and completion for each preparation program offered by the unit; illustration of how these compare with state standards and state and national norms; description of screening and monitoring procedures; evidence of competence of those who complete the programs; information about the unit's student demographics; documentation of student program completion rate and reasons for non-completion; descriptions of quota restrictions for enrollment in programs and the rationale for those quotas; evidence of continuous assessment of programs and use of findings in the refinement of those offerings; description of counseling and advising policies, procedures and practices.

Standard IV - The Knowledge Base for Preparation Programs.

All preparation programs for professional school personnel within the institution will be reviewed. It will be incumbent upon the unit to demonstrate its use of appropriate educational research findings as the base for its curricula, instruction and practices. Scholarly activities within the unit and the implementation of appropriate theories undergirding programs will need to be documented. Such a standard is a dramatic departure from current NCATE expectations. The standard is suggested as a result of the growing concern that not enough teacher education institutions incorporate state-of-the-art knowledge and accepted best practice. The standard should encourage units to assess systematically the theory and knowledge base upon which their programs and practices are predicated. It is not designed to coerce units into operationalizing any particular theoretical or knowledge base. Rather, the burden of proof is on the unit to demonstrate that its programs are cognizant of ongoing scholarship related to teaching/learning, teacher effectiveness and other major components of educational research. Is the faculty aware of leading lines of inquiry? Do syllabi reflect current references? Do program objectives reflect the AACTE Profile of a Beginning Teacher; NEA's Excellence in Our Schools; generic teaching knowledge and skills such as those described in Essential Knowledge for Beginning Teachers and Handbook of the Florida Performance Measurement System?*; Are ongoing scholarly efforts a norm within the unit? These are among questions on which this standard will focus.

*AACTE Task Force on Profiles of Excellence, Educating a Profession: Profile of a Beginning Teacher, AACTE, February, 1983.

National Education Association. Excellence in Our Schools Teacher Education: An Action Plan. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1982.

Smith, D., ed. Essential Knowledge for Beginning Teachers. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, to be released Summer 1983.

Handbook of the Florida Performance Measurement System. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Beginning Teacher Program, Office of Teacher Education, Certification and Inservice Staff Development, 1982.

Suggested Sources of Evidence. A program folio of approximately two pages for each preparation program that contains, as appropriate to level, program objectives, general studies, the teaching or other professional specialty(ies), foundational studies (including multicultural education, special education and computer education), teaching and learning theory, research methods, clinical experiences integral to the program (including laboratory, practicum, internship and other experiences) both on and off campus, and options open to students within the program; documentation of use of curriculum guidelines of national professional associations and learned societies; evidence of quality controls (including those related to the granting of graduate credit, the minimum amount of graduate level work required in an advanced program and residence study); institutional and/or unit bulletins and other descriptions of curricula; syllabi for the courses offered; and documentation of the use of the knowledge base in the above.

Standard V - Relationship to the World of Practice.

This standard will recaste a number of points made in the current standards that encourage linkages between professional preparation and school practices. It addresses the concern that teacher education programs need to relate to actual conditions in schools and incorporate the knowledge and experience of practitioners. The unit will be asked to describe all its working relationships with schools, professional organizations, teacher associations and other agencies appropriate to its missions. If a unit conducts a lab school, this will be the appropriate section in which the work of the school is described. More likely, the unit will describe a range of activities with cooperating school systems, many of which will be clinical in nature. If school personnel serve on admission or retention committees, this fact will serve as another illustration of an involvement with the practicing profession. Since the gulf between theory and practice is faced by all institutions, ways by which the gap is systematically addressed should be included in the unit's self-study.

Suggested Sources of Evidence. Documentation and description of relationships, formal and informal, with schools and other agencies appropriate to the mission of the unit; description of the various linkages with professional organizations; evidence that clinical experiences are an integral part of all preparation programs and that clinical settings, both on and off campus, are available and used by all students; documentation showing that the practicing profession is continuously and officially involved in the activities of the unit, including program review and instruction; demonstration of how the unit and its faculty members make their work and programs relevant to the world of practice; documentation of policies, procedures and practices related to the selection and operation of clinical settings and for the selection and functioning of professional personnel in them who are involved in preparation programs; evidence that the various clinical experiences in each program are of sufficient length to ensure an appropriate level of competence upon their completion.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS AND VISITING TEAMS

Thus far, this proposal has described new components for an accreditation system focusing on the professional education unit and five unit standards for accreditation decision-making purposes. It is readily acknowledged that the system, despite improvements in focus and clarity, will not succeed without corresponding improvements in the accreditation implementation process. The following two sections, therefore, describe proposed changes in the process for visiting team selection and operation and and processes for seeking accreditation and continuing accreditation reviews. The final two sections discuss the Council's decision-making process and how the proposed alternative accreditation system might occur.

To address concerns cited earlier about visiting team expertise and consistency, this proposal includes establishment of a Board of Examiners composed of a relatively small number of people drawn equally from the ranks of NEA, AACTE, and the other constituent members from which visiting teams would be assembled. Each person would be nominated for the Board by constituent members on the basis of demonstrated expertise in teacher education, teaching, research and/or evaluation; they should also be willing to undergo extensive training in the meaning and application of NCATE standards. Above all else, it is imperative that no person be included who lacks the ability to be a good evaluator. The terms of the board members will be three years with individual terms staggered to insure continuity. Initially, it might be advisable to appoint examiners for two-, three- or four-year terms during what would be a difficult "break in" period. Each member of the Board would agree to serve on two or three visiting teams each year.

From the Board of Examiners, visiting teams could be drawn by NCATE staff on a number of bases. Members could be assigned to a team for a one-year period or to three different teams during the course of a year. Membership could also vary depending upon the kind of institution being visited, although it may be preferable not to assign teams exclusively to large or small institutions or to differentiate examiners on the basis of public or private control. NCATE should experiment with these and other strategies for forming teams to identify the most viable. The Chair of the team would be appointed by NCATE.

Teams will be considerably smaller on the average than at present. It is our judgment that for accreditation visits a team could work productively with five members. For sixth-year review visits (see "Accreditation Process" described below), teams will probably need no more than three people.

Despite these alterations in the size and composition of NCATE teams, the concept of parity can be maintained. Under this proposal NCATE policies will provide that all teams should have at least one representative from the three basic constituencies and that over a year's time, the total number from each constituency will be approximately equal to each of the others.

This new team arrangement is designed to produce the conditions under which the teams can do high quality work. The intent is to make appointment to the Board of Examiners a prestigious, professional event and to provide adequate training, especially for the team chair, and time for the team to do a reliable job of evaluation.

Team Visits

Under this proposal team visits will be conducted in much the same manner as at present. Visits will be made either in the spring (February/March) or fall (October/November) as is now the case. Teams must, of course, be given adequate time for careful work on campus and for the preparation of a thoughtful and comprehensive team report. Initially, teams will be scheduled for about the same time on campuses as now, but if that time frame proves too short to do high quality work, additional time must be provided. Special care also must be taken by NCATE to demonstrate to the field that its teams are doing highly reliable work.

Visits by the team chair in advance of the site visit will be discontinued. The team will receive the Unit Report well in advance of the visit; the current requirement of 30 days in advance should be rigidly enforced. The chair will have available any information submitted to NCATE by the institution, for example, annual reports and other data sets. Thus, the chair will be able to examine all relevant materials and if questions arise, the chair could contact the IHE or NCATE for comment or further information. The chair, in consultation with the NCATE staff, may postpone a visit if all of the necessary information is not in hand on time.

Teams will meet as a group in advance of the visit, most likely on site the day before the scheduled visit. The purpose of these meetings will be to discuss the reports from the institution, clarify assignments and identify specific problems before the visit starts.

The team chair will be responsible for preparing a team report which will be due 30 days after the visit. The report will be composed of the team's analysis of data presented by the unit; any additional data the team finds bearing on the fulfillment of the standards; and, the team's impressions and judgments as to how well the unit has performed with respect to each of the standards. Especially important is the team's judgment regarding the extent to which the various programs of the unit meet the standard on the knowledge base.

An important change in the process from current practice is the CAA proposal that the team recommend an accreditation action to the Council. This recommendation is consistent with the team concept contained in this proposal--that of a relatively small, well-trained expert group which occupies a key position in the evaluation process. It seems logical that NCATE would solicit the recommendation on accreditation from this expert group as it is in the best position to know. The team report will be sent to the institution with the information that a rejoinder may be filed on any aspect of the report according to a format to be determined by the Council.

THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS*

Overview

In the previous section reference was made to two types of team visits, those for accreditation purposes and those for the purpose of sixth-year review. This reference alludes to another fundamental component of this proposal: the clear distinction between processes for seeking accreditation and for continuing accreditation reviews. These processes are described in detail in this section preceeded by an overview of basic concepts to assist in the reader's review.

The process of seeking accreditation is similar to obtaining initial accreditation in the present system. An institution prepares a Unit Report (UR); a team visits the campus and prepares a report (TR); the UR and TR provide the basis for Council decisions.

A new concept central to this proposal is continuing accreditation, replacing what in current practice is referred to as re-accreditation. Fundamental to the system proposed is the granting of accreditation for an unspecified term and annual monitoring to provide assurance that accredited teacher education units maintain conditions requisite for high quality programs.

The process to be described in this section includes the following sequence:

- o a professional teacher education unit seeks accreditation; if accreditation is granted, the sequence continues as below;
- o data from the annual report are monitored each year to ascertain the continuing viability of the unit;
- o three years after accreditation, an NCATE audit committee reviews data bank information for evidence that accreditability remains;
- o six years after accreditation, a review team studies data bank information and an updated UR and visits the institution; and,
- o the process continues with annual monitoring of data bank information, third year audit committee reviews, and sixth year review visits.

The sequence and timeline described above would be altered if, during any annual or three year review, a visit to the institution is requested by the Council. If an institution were to lose accredited status, the process for that institution would revert to the beginning, to seeking accreditation.

---

*Throughout this section the committee has included specific recommendations for timelines for the proposed system. These recommendations represent our best thoughts, but they are provided to assist readers in understanding the total nature of the proposal. We encourage readers not to allow specifics to detract from the basic principles in the proposal. The elements of the timeline may well be modified, if proposal is accepted, as work continues in implementing the new system.

Continuing accreditation impacts several aspects of this proposal and contributes significantly to the way in which the proposal responds to pervasive concerns about the current system. Within the proposed system an accredited teacher education unit retains accreditation indefinitely, until the Council revokes it or until an institution indicates that it no longer wishes to participate in NCATE. Revocation of accreditation could be based on evidence that the institution no longer meets the criteria or on failure of the institution to pay fees or to file annual reports.

The significance of the concept of continuing accreditation includes:

- o accreditation can be cancelled at any time; failure to meet the standards leads to a review visit to the unit and Council action based on the review team recommendation;
- o as implied above, units are required to remain in compliance with the standards on a continuing basis; continuous (annual) review replaces the current periodic review;
- o institutions need not develop elaborate unit reports (URs) at specified time intervals; annual reports and updates of prior URs provide the basis for review;
- o annual reporting of relevant data through AACTE creates a national data bank which: is a resource for continuous review at the institutional and national levels and program planning at the unit level; provides the basis for continuing accreditation reviews; provides up-to-date comprehensive data about teacher education units in this country;
- o the collegial relationship between NCATE and institutions is enhanced; NCATE and institutions can focus attention on the improvement of teacher education, over and above the meeting of minimum standards.

The continuity of review and the attendant concept of continuing accreditation will enhance institutional review and planning and provide continuous assurance to the profession and the public that conditions for accreditation are being maintained.

Seeking Accreditation. (See Appendix for proposed application format.)

A unit seeking NCATE accreditation submits a UR that follows established guidelines. A site visit is conducted, and the team submits a report (TR) to which the unit prepares an official response.

- o If the Council determines that the unit is accreditable, the head of the unit is notified of that fact.
- o If it is determined that the unit fails to meet NCATE standards, the unit is told that accreditation has been denied.

Unit Report

A basic principle of NCATE accreditation is that the burden of proof rests on the unit to demonstrate that it meets the quality standards of the Council. Another such principle is that the Unit Report (UR) provides the basis for the site visit and ultimately the Council's accreditation decision. Taken together, these principles clearly indicate the importance of the UR in the NCATE process. The UR follows a standard format, but the substance and presentation within that format is the responsibility of the unit.

Format for Initial UR

- o Copy of the Accreditation Application Report Form and other application materials documenting that the preconditions for eligibility do exist
- o Standard I - Operation and Resources of the Unit
- o Standard II - The Faculty
- o Standard III - The Students
- o Standard IV - The Knowledge base for Preparation Programs
- o Standard V - Relationship to the World of Practice

In providing the information necessary to show that it meets the Standards, the unit is responsible for the completeness of the data and discussion and for putting them in a form that is unambiguous and readily comprehensible to team and Council members. The use of charts, graphs, diagrams, tables and other similar means of presenting information is encouraged. These must be accompanied by adequate narrative description to make the point clear to those who need to read the UR.

Each standard is followed by a list of suggested sources of evidence intended as a guide in the preparation of the UR. The list is not exhaustive of all possibilities; neither are the items presented in any special order, nor are they all relevant to every unit. Once again, it is the unit's responsibility to make its own case in as complete, terse and effective a way as possible.

Data Bank

A central feature of the proposed system is the creation of a different reporting system including a data bank for monitoring the ability of units to maintain programs of high quality and to expand the information that can be reported in the NCATE Annual List. The data will represent the quantification of the standards to obtain indicators of quality. Examples of the data elements are included in the Appendix. A suggested process for developing a consensus set of elements, establishing the ways to combine data within standards, and for scaling standards to arrive at an accreditation decision is included in the section on "Implementation of the Proposal."

Accreditation Review

The AACTE Annual Report will be modified to include the elements identified as relevant to NCATE standards. Thus institutions will be able to supply requested data to AACTE and provide information for the NCATE data bank in one report. Summaries and analyses provided by AACTE [illegible] Annual List [illegible] local institutional review and planning.

When a teacher education unit applies for initial accreditation, it will be required to submit an Annual Report (AR) to AACTE. This information will be used as one aspect for establishing eligibility for NCATE accreditation, and the data will be provided to visiting team members for use during their visit.

Subsequent to achieving accreditation, the unit will continue to submit the AR to AACTE, and data will be entered into the NCATE data bank. The primary use of the data within the accreditation process will be for monitoring the continuing accreditability of the institution.

Annual Monitoring and Review

To assure the Council that each unit continues to meet criteria for accreditation, individual Annual Reports will be monitored using measures and procedures to be developed by the Council. If problems are identified, they will be noted and reported to the Council.

- Should the Council find the lack of compliance to be minimal, the unit will be informed of the nature of the problems, and what can be done to resolve them; the unit will have until the next Annual Report to meet all criteria; if any of the identified characteristics continue to be problematical at that time, a site visit will be required.
- If the lack of compliance is more pronounced, the unit is notified of that fact, told which criteria are not met, and given a specified period to prepare an appropriate update of its last UR and to arrange for a site visit.
    - After the site visit, the team will submit a TR to which the unit will prepare an official response.
    - If, following the visit, the Council decides the unit remains accreditable, the head of the unit will be notified, and regular reporting procedures continue.
    - If it is determined that the unit no longer meets NCATE standards, the unit will be informed that accreditation has been terminated.

It is not expected that the Council will find frequent cases of pronounced lack of compliance. Examples of conditions causing such a Council action might include significant loss of faculty to a level inadequate for the number of unit programs; or significant decline of GPAs of students entering teacher education programs.

Third Year Review

The third year after the year of the last site visit, the Council will review Annual Reports from each unit to determine if an on-site visit is needed. Audit committees will be established for this process.

- o If it is found that a visit will be not necessary, the unit is notified and regular reporting procedures will continue.
- o If the need for a visit is determined, the unit will be informed of the factors that led to the decision and advised that it has a specified period of time to prepare an appropriate update of its last UR and arrange for the visit.
    - o If, following the visit, the Council decides that the unit remains accreditable, the head of the unit will be notified and regular reporting procedures will continue.
    - o If it is determined that the unit no longer meets NCATE standards, the unit will be informed that accreditation has been terminated.

Sixth-Year Review Visit. The sixth year after the year of the last visit a review team will visit the unit. In preparation for the visit, the unit should prepare an appropriate update of its last UR based on the subsequent Annual Reports. After the visit, the team will submit a TR to which the unit prepare an official response.

- o If, following the visit, the Council decides the unit remains accreditable, the head of the unit will be notified, and regular reporting procedures will continue.
- o If it is determined that the unit no longer meets NCATE standards, the unit will be informed that accreditation has been terminated.

The Annual List

In this proposed system the Annual NCATE List will be expanded to provide more complete information about accredited units. Institutions will be allowed to prepare a statement of proscribed length to describe the characteristics of their programs they believe should be highlighted. In addition, the Annual List will include norms for those data collected in the Annual Report of greatest importance to prospective students and employers. Institutional entries will include the factual data in the same categories for which the norms have been developed.

THE COUNCIL'S DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The Council will treat accreditation cases at its March and October meetings as is current practice. In assessing the recommendations from teams, the Council will follow the following procedures:

- The Council will be divided into audit committees of at least three members each, following the established parity formula. The NCATE staff will assign cases to the audit committees so as to distribute the case load equitably among the Council members.

- The audit committees will operate much as they do now. The chair will schedule meetings of the group and be responsible for conducting proper audits of team reports. The basic purpose for an audit is to determine whether the recommendation of the team seems warranted on the basis of the UR, other available data and the team report. The audit committee, then, is responsible for an examination of the record and a verification of the recommendation.

- Each audit committee will make an action recommendation on the basis of its study. This recommendation can be to grant or to deny accreditation to the institution.

- Action by the Council on any recommendation of an audit committee will take place at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Council. The reason for this delay is so that the unit may be informed as to the specific recommendation on which the Council will act.

- The Council will also review Annual Report data three years following an accreditation visit and three years following a review visit. These reviews will be conducted by the audit committees in a manner to be determined by the Council. A team visit will occur at least every six years following initial accreditation.

- For each accreditation review case the audit committee will compile and assess the relevant information from the unit's last UR, TR and unit response; the unit's last three Annual Reports; and, if the review results from a Council decision that an "interim visit" was necessary, the specifics of that decision and the factors on which it was based. The committee will then develop a report consisting of its assessment of the data at hand and its recommendation for continuing or terminating the unit's accreditation.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL

There are several ways in which the transition from the current NCATE system to the proposed alternative could be accomplished. However, a phased transition would cause the fewest logistical problems and least disruption for institutions. This proposal includes the recommendation that an effective date for the new system be established, for example, the fall of 1985, and that the target date for completion of the transition be five years later, or May, 1990. The transition could proceed as follows:

- o Data collection will be initiated during the fall of 1985; institutions will report 1984-5 data;
- o The 1985 Annual List will include all institutions with accredited programs (or categories) at the time of transition;
- o Institutional entries in the 1985 Annual List will include data from the unit's Annual Report to AACTE and a paragraph describing the main features of the unit and its program emphases;
- o The Annual List will include norms for the data submitted by institutions;
- o Procedures for the 1985-6 accreditation visits will be those recommended in this proposal;
- o As institutions come on-line for an NCATE visit, whether full or mini under the current process, they will be reviewed under the procedures and standards of the new process;
- o Subsequent to adoption of the new system and prior to 1985-6, NCATE reviews will use the existing system; (An alternative to this procedure is to declare a moratorium until the new system is in place, backdating the next scheduled visit by the time required for implementation; were this option selected, we would recommend implementation one year earlier; i.e., Fall 1984.)
- o By fall, 1986, the Council could have established the basis for combining information to obtain a composite assessment on which accreditation decisions are based. The following section describes a suggested procedure for this process.

Quantification of Standards

As noted earlier in this document, a central feature of the proposed system is the creation of a data bank for monitoring the ability of units to maintain programs of high quality and to expand the information that can be reported in the NCATE Annual List. The specific data elements to be included and the way in which the measures will be reported should be determined through involvement of institutions and other stakeholders. However, examples that represent quantification of the standards are included in the Appendix. The following describes a way in which the usefulness and appropriateness of the data elements could be determined empirically to obtain a composite assessment on which to base accreditation decisions.

Factors related to most of the standards can be quantified. For example, the standard on students logically produces elements related to GPA standards for admission, retention and graduation; average GPAs for recent classes enhance the information related to quality of students at an institution. NCATE stakeholders should be involved in identifying the elements to be included in the new system. This could be accomplished through the use of a modified Delphi process, the goals of which are to identify the data elements for which a consensus of stakeholders exists; a way to combine elements within each standard to obtain a composite description of the standard; and ways to combine assessments of standards to produce a measure of accreditability. The sequence of activities might take this form:

- o A list of elements, such as the examples in this document, is distributed and participants are asked to indicate the extent to which they believe the element is important and to suggest modifications for the way in which the element is expressed.
- o Responses are summarized, median values of support are indicated, and participants are asked to rate the elements again.
- o Responses are analyzed, and a tentative decision is made about the elements to retain and the methods to be used in expressing the measures.
- o The revised list is used to create a paired-comparison exercise for the elements within each of the standards. The standards, also, are presented in a paired-comparison exercise.
- o Responses are analyzed to create a paradigm for combining the elements within each standard and to weight the importance of each standard in ascertaining the accredibility of a unit.

In addition to the use of professional judgments to identify and scale data elements and to scale standards, studies could be initiated to ascertain the relationship of the standards-related data elements to measures of the quality of graduates from professional education programs. Test data such as scores from the NTE, GRE or other tests such as those developed by state certification agencies could be collected. Measures derived from beginning teacher evaluation programs could also be obtained. Thus it would be possible to submit data reflecting input, process and output to multiple regression and factor analysis.

The pooling of professional judgments and empirical data would provide a rational and explicit basis for the use of data in guiding teams and the Council in arriving at accreditation decisions and for monitoring the continuing accreditability of units.

V.

PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

This proposal has evolved through several stages. Various drafts have been reported to the constituencies within AACTE as well as the other stakeholders in NCATE. The reactions have been invaluable in helping shape each successive version. The Committee greatly appreciates the many comments and suggestions received. All have contributed to this final product. The following groups have provided reactions to this proposal:

Constituencies within AACTE

Board of Directors
Executive Committee
Advisory Council of State Representatives
Task Force on Accreditation
Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education Executive Committee
Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities
Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Institutions
Membership, 1982 Annual Meeting

NCATE Constituencies

Council
Coordinating Board
National Education Association and AACTE Representatives to the Council

Related Constituencies

Association of State Colleges and Universities, Task Force on Accreditation, 1982
North Central Association, Workshop on Teacher Education, 1982

As noted above, the development of this proposal has been enhanced by groups and individuals that have provided suggestions and pointed out inconsistencies or inherent difficulties associated with aspects of earlier drafts. The current draft includes modification of some aspects of the earlier conceptualizations. Suggestions have been incorporated where they comply with the proposal's basic structure; however all concerns were not accommodated.

Unit Size

In drafting this proposal, the Committee considered a range of opinion regarding the proposed changes. It recognized widespread concerns that the proposed changes might favor one group over another; that is, large institutions over small, public over private, universities over four-year institutions and so on. The Committee's view is that accreditation is a means to raise the quality of teacher preparation and that high standards are essential to the enhancement of the teaching profession. Accordingly, the goal has been to develop recommendations applicable to the total range of institutions currently in the teacher education enterprise.

There is no doubt that as questions of quality are escalated, some institutions will have an easier time meeting standards than others. Concurrently, there is no reason to believe that certain types of institutions necessarily have advantage over others. Small institutions, for example, have certain attributes that are highly conducive to strong programs, assuming that sufficient faculty depth and other resources are available. Conversely, although resources and faculty depth may be more commonly found in large institutions, the unit's commitments or utilization of resources may not be conducive to first-rate programs. In the Committee's view, while "large versus small" is a legitimate concern and a variable in assessing any unit, the size of an institution in and of itself does not determine whether the quality of students, faculty and other factors noted in the standards are being implemented at a high level. It is the purpose of accreditation to determine the level of quality; unit size is only one factor in the assessment process, and certainly not the prime variable.

Unit Definition

A major concern expressed by several groups about the October draft of this proposal was the way in which the unit was defined. In addition to questions about ambiguity, the substantive issue was elimination of advanced programs in fields for which initial certification is normally associated with an earlier degree level. In this draft, the scope of NCATE accreditation is defined in terms of NCATE's current authorization; that is, all work related to school-based professionals. Thus the unit is defined as the administrative structure of an institution directly responsible for policy and implementation of professional education programs.

Unit as Related to Programs and Curriculum

Another major concern was the elimination of curriculum from the unit standards. This proposal represents an important change to earlier drafts in that although accreditation is unit-focused, the knowledge base standard is broadened through the additional requirement of two-page folios for each program at each degree level. The program information would be used to assess the quality of the unit, not for making separate program or category accreditation decisions. Programs which have particular strengths and weaknesses, however, would be cited in the NCATE Action Letter.

Related to the concern about the curriculum standard was the position taken by this Committee that national accreditation need not be program or category specific since states have legal authority for approving programs. We believe this position is still tenable and appropriate. NCATE should continue to review guidelines for curriculum, for example, the AACTE Profile and the NEA Excellence documents as they describe initial teacher education curriculum and specialty group curriculum standards for school service personnel programs. As noted elsewhere, NCATE and its constituents should combine efforts at the state level for the adoption of these curriculum standards. An example of such cooperation already exists through the NEA-AACTE collaboration in several pilot states to apply the procedures for review of program approval processes as described in Excellence in Our Schools: Teacher Education.

Standards as Related to Quantification

Another concern expressed was the lack of specificity in the proposed standards and the data bank elements. In this document we have proposed a focus for the standards, suggested sources of evidence and described a process for identifying and developing data bank elements for eventual application to the standards. We believe that further specification of the standards should follow adoption of this proposal through established NCATE processes.

It should be noted here that reactions also included much support for the way in which this proposal reduced the overlap and duplication between state and national processes, reduced the proliferation of accrediting standards, and addressed several problems with teams mentioned frequently by institutions of higher education. We believe that the current draft is responsive to major concerns while retaining the strength and viability of the original proposal structure.

VI.

PROPOSAL IMPLICATIONS

Although not central to the Committee's original charge to develop an alternative accreditation system, there is concern about certain implications the new system might have which determine the feasibility of the proposed alternative. The Committee has therefore developed this section on proposal implications which it believes address the the major concerns, including effects of the proposal on costs involved for institutions seeking accreditation and the NCATE constituents; NCATE organization and governance; and NCATE staff responsibilities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The primary purpose of this proposal is to improve the process of accreditation, not necessarily to effect changes in the financial condition of NCATE. It is clear, however, that in a number of areas, the proposal has financial consequences; some of the suggested changes will increase the cost of the accreditation process, while others will result in a decrease. The following section analyzes several of these areas of cost consequence.

Costs Associated with Teams.

In all likelihood, the costs associated with teams and team visits would be reduced from current levels. This conclusion results from the following analysis:

- At present NCATE teams average nine people each. At current cost levels, expenses for each team would average about $5,700. Airfare = $350 x 1 roundtrip for 8 people, 2 roundtrips for the chair; per diem @ $70 for 9 people for 3 1/2 days: $3,500 + $2,205.
- Under this proposal the average team size will be five persons. Expenses will average about $3,100 - $3,200 per team under same price levels and with adding another half day to the team time. Airfare = $350 x 1 roundtrip each; per diem at $70 for 5 people for 4 days: $1,750 + $1,400. Thus, NCATE will be able to pay each team member $100 per day and team chairs an extra $100 for report preparation or pay the team chair a flat $400 for the time and effort expended or pay the cost of substitutes for teachers and still show an average savings of $1,900 - $2,300 over present costs of team visits.
- NCATE would save additionally because the administrative burden of assigning teams would be sharply reduced and, although there will be increased attention to training, the overall training costs will be less. In a recent year NCATE was scheduled to conduct 12 team training sessions which required one or two staff people to spend three days each--more than two months of staff time in training alone. Since no more than 70 new people will need training each year compared with about 400 in 1981-82, more than five times as much time could be spent on training each one than is spent now at no additional cost.

o Other costs of team visits such as mailing and preparing reports would not be much different than now.

Costs to Institutions through Dues.

Currently IHE's pay a flat annual fee for NCATE accreditation and an additional fee for each program level and each category being accredited. This system works as follows.

There is a basic $300 minimum which entitles an institution to one program (for example, elementary) at one level (for example, BA). In addition, 25 percent of the minimum is charged for the first program at the MA level and 20 percent of the minimum each for the first program at both the specialist and Ph.D. levels. Further, one percent of the minimum is charged for each additional category of program (elementary, K-12, supervision and guidance) beyond the first at each level. There is a total of 41 categories in which programs could be a accredited if an institution filled all of the possible cells.

Thus, the maximum amount of dues it is possible to pay currently is $606. This amount is determined as follows: $300 + (65% x $300) +37 categories (four are paid for in the 65% fee) x $3 (1%) = $300 + $195 + $111 = $606. Obviously, the range of dues is $300 per year to $606, and the average for 1982-83 is almost $400.

In this proposal there will only be one annual accreditation fee to pay without an additional payment for levels and categories. This will mean that minimum dues will have to increase slightly to maintain the same level of income: that is, dues will have to be set at the current average figure in order to maintain income. Dues, therefore, will increase slightly for some and decrease somewhat for others.

It is possible that the Council and the Coordinating Board may consider a revision of the dues structure of NCATE by creating a sliding fee scale dependent upon unit size or by adding a visitation fee, a practice which is common among other accreditation agencies. Each of these measures has been discussed by both Council and Coordinating Board members. While they may occur in the future, they are not made necessary by this proposal.

Costs Related to Continuing Accreditation.

The costs of the proposed process of continuing accreditation would appear to have some budget consequences, but these cannot be estimated precisely at this time.

The proposed system requires a review visit no more than six years from the time of the last preceding visit. Since it is anticipated that most units will not have review visits at intervals of less than six years, the cost of visits will probably be reduced for most. This stems from the fact that under the present NCATE system interim visits follow re-accreditation visits at five year intervals, and in most cases the next re-accreditation visits occur five years later. Therefore, most institutions are visited every five years now,

whereas most units will have review visits at six year intervals under this proposal. This difference should result in some savings both to units and to NCATE.

The Annual Report that the unit must submit will consist of information readily available within the unit and its institution and should, at worst, add only marginally to the cost of the initial data collection.

Because the Unit Report will be based in large part on data already collected and submitted in Annual Reports, the unit will save some of the costs involved with staff time for its preparation. The larger, more complex Annual List that will result from this procedure will be more costly for NCATE to publish, but the magnitude of the increase cannot be determined now.

The third-year reviews and audits of team reports and unit responses by Council audit committees will require different uses of Council resources. With some 175 third-year reviews and 105 audits to conduct each year, more time will be needed for the audit committees to complete their work than under the present system. This may require extending Council meetings by a day or so, adding another Council meeting each year, holding audit committee work sessions between Council meetings, turning over some portion of the review work to the staff, or some combination of these. It appears, however, that this element of the proposal will be somewhat more costly than the present approach.

Effects of Unit Accreditation

Accreditation on the basis of the unit in teacher education rather than on the bases of levels and categories appears to have minor budget consequences. Since visits will not be needed on an "interim" basis to review new levels or categories, the number of overall visits may be reduced. Accreditation on a unit basis may also make it possible to reduce Council meeting time, but this seems conjectural at this point.

It should be noted that some of the consequences identified above affect only institutions, while others affect both institutions and the NCATE infrastructure-- the costs of which are carried by institutional dues and by the dues of constituent members of NCATE. Since IHEs pay the entire costs of team visits, any reduction or increase affects institutions directly and solely. The costs of NCATE meetings to make accreditation decisions are borne by both the constituents and by the dues collected from institutions. Any changes in this area might well result in an increase or decrease in dues for both constituents and institutions.

Recognizing that only a very crude, overall estimate can be made now, it still seems safe to assume that the effects of this proposal will be to decrease accreditation costs borne by IHEs and hold constant other costs associated with the process.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF NCATE

The focus of NCATE accreditation central to this proposal is the unit responsible for programs for educating teachers and other school personnel. Although the use of the knowledge base and relationships to practice are reviewed as they relate to program content and curriculum, decisions will not be made for individual programs or categories of programs. It is the unit which will be accredited or denied.

This proposal includes recommendations that learned societies and professional specialty organizations continue to participate in NCATE and that NCATE retain a vigorous role in assuring strong and appropriate curricula in the various professional specialties. Indeed, the goals of the current proposal can be achieved optimally only if these conditions exist.

The governance and organization of NCATE are premised on the belief that accreditation in education should reflect judgments of representatives of the major stakeholders in the professional preparation endeavor. These groups include practicing professionals, teacher education generalists and representatives of the learned societies and specialty organizations. The Constitution, Bylaws and policies of NCATE since 1974 reflect the belief that designated representatives from these major sectors should cooperate as equals in developing standards and processes that can be applied to the general accreditation endeavor. The rotation of membership among the many societies and organizations operationalizes the conviction that representatives are not selected as advocates of individual fields but rather to provide balance and perspective to the central role of NCATE. Deans, professors, teachers, administrators and public representatives are expected to subordinate their vested interest in applying their talents to the accreditation of programs and categories for which NCATE has responsibility. This proposal recognizes the historical basis for NCATE membership and advocates a return to the original purpose for joint ownership of the process.

NCATE will retain its advocacy position for strong and appropriate curricula in professional education. The existing processes and criteria for the approval of curriculum standards will be retained and strengthened. Specialty organizations will be encouraged to develop and submit standards for NCATE review. NCATE will expand its advocacy programs for the standards which have been endorsed. This can be accomplished in several ways.

The NCATE Annual List will include a section identifying the standards which have been approved. The book of NCATE standards will also include the list. In addition, NCATE will notify state agencies and institutions when standards are approved. In each state section of the Annual List there will be an indication of the approved specialty standards included in state approval requirements.

Advocacy also can occur in a more proactive way through the organizations comprising NCATE. For example, most states have units affiliated with NEA, AACTE, ATE and some of the learned societies and specialty organizations. By focusing the human resources of these groups on the need for state approval processes and criteria to reflect the NCATE approved curriculum standards, the

profession could have a profound influence on the quality of content and curriculum for professional education programs. As noted earlier, NEA and AACTE are already collaborating in pilot states on procedures for review of the program approval process.

Through a combination of national and state level advocacy, NCATE and its constituents can realize a non-redundant system of unit accreditation at the national level and state approval which comprehensively assesses the quality of individual programs and the ability of units to support programs in professional education.

While the system of accreditation described in this proposal does not require any modification of the membership, organization or governance of NCATE, the Committee is aware of strengths and tensions within the current model and has discussed changes that might be desirable at this time.

We strongly recommend retention of the equal participation and representation among NEA, AACTE and specialty groups and involvement of public representatives. Governance based on the principle of parity should be enhanced.

The current organization could be changed, we believe, to streamline the process and strengthen the accountability needs of the accreditation enterprise. We recommend that the Coordinating Board be abolished and that its functions be assigned to a Council Executive Committee which includes the immediate past, present and elect Council chairs; the presidents of NEA and AACTE or their representatives; and one person elected by the other members of the Council to represent the specialty groups and the public.

The Executive Committee will have responsibility for approving budgets and providing assurance that financial resources will equal or exceed annual expenditures; for employing NCATE staff personnel; for approving changes in Constitution and Bylaws; for approving membership in those positions which are for organizations approved for term membership; and for providing the liaison required with the organizations which support and participate in the Council processes.

As noted above, no changes are required to implement this proposal; however, the adoption of a new process creates a timely opportunity for organizational change to increase effectiveness of the organization.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NCATE STAFF

Many of the current NCATE staff responsibilities will be unaffected by the adoption of this proposal. However, the new system will require some modification in use of staff time and add responsibilities not associated with the current system.

Development of Teams

Staff will continue to develop teams following the existing principles of representation. The reduction in team size will simplify the process in some ways, but increase the problems of appropriate representation. The data bank for the Board of Examiners must include appropriate cross-references and multiple descriptors so that individuals can be identified through several key factors. Staff will need to develop procedures for building continuing accreditation teams and ways to balance evaluator use across initial and continuing accreditation visits. Providing adequate computer support will enable staff to monitor this process without undue difficulty.

Training

A key aspect of this proposal is the enhanced quality of visiting teams through effective training sessions. Staff will be required to provide leadership in developing training materials and procedures, schedules for training and methods to evaluate training effectiveness. The number of new examiners to train each year must be carefully estimated since the cost will prohibit training of more people than required to maintain a Board of Examiners of appropriate size.

Data and Reports

Under the proposed system, staff will need to devote a considerable amount of time to develop appropriate data processing for the material collected annually from institutions. Norms and institutional entries will be updated annually, and the sensitivity of the data will require extremely well-developed procedures to ensure accuracy in the data published in the Annual List.

The staff will also need to develop paradigms for the annual scanning of data for the purpose of continuing accreditation. Related to this, procedures must be developed for Council consideration of problems identified by the scan. Procedures for third year reviews and sixth-year review visits must be developed, and logistical problems must be anticipated.

As noted earlier, the expanded Annual List plays an important role in the proposed system. Automated data processing and word processing equipment will reduce some of the burden for staff, but extremely careful monitoring will be required. In addition, this system will add to the need for frequent communication between NCATE staff and institutional representatives. Systems for all of these factors must be developed by staff, under the direction of the Council and drawing on expertise in evaluation and related areas.

VII.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Applying for Accreditation and the Preconditions

Application

To establish eligibility for accreditation evaluation by NCATE an institution must submit (1) a letter of application signed by the dean, director, or chair of its professional education unit, (2) a completed Accreditation Application Report form, (3) documentation showing that eight preconditions exist, and (4) a copy of the self-study prepared for the most recent State approval decision. Specific directions for preparing and submitting these materials and copies of the Accreditation Application Report form may be obtained from:

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 202
Washington, D.C. 20006

Accreditation Application Report

This form is completed by the institution. It provides basic information about the institution and its professional education unit. The type of information that might be requested on the form is attached.

Preconditions

A baccalaureate or graduate degree granting institution may establish eligibility for an accreditation evaluation by NCATE if these eight conditions exist at the level stipulated by the Council:

1. The unit is the college, school or department within the institution that is officially responsible for the preparation of students who seek state certification as techers and/or school service personnel.

2. A dean, director, or chair is officially designated to represent the unit and assign the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation.

3. There are well-established, unambiguous, and comprehensive policies and procedures upon which the operation of the unit rests.

4. There are explicit and appropriate linkages between the unit and (a) other policy-making units, groups and administrative offices within the institution, (b) institution-sponsored support operations, (c) school, organizations, companies, and agencies to whose welfare the unit may contribute and/or from which the unit may receive assistance.

5. The operation of the unit and the scope and quality of its offerings are regularly monitored and evaluated both internally and externally, in the latter case using the same criteria, process, and timeline employed with other similar units within the institution; the results of these periodic reviews are used for planning and for refinement of the operation of the unit and its programs.

6. The unit and/or its programs is(are) approved by the appropriate State agency or agencies.

7. The institution is fully accredited by the appropriate regional accreditation association.

8. The institution is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate unlawfully on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, age, or handicap.

Documentation that preconditions exist

The institution must provide clear evidence that these eight preconditions exist at the level stipulated by the Council. Since the professional education unit is the focus of NCATE accreditation, a description of its membership and administrative structure is required. It is incumbent upon the institution to show that there is only one such unit within its confines and that this unit has primary responsibility for the design, approval, implementation, and continuous evaluation and development of all the institution's certification programs for teachers and school service personnel. The institution must also demonstrate that the unit has both the authority and responsibility for:

1. Setting and achieving professional goals in the institution.

2. Establishing appropriate policies for governance, programs, admission and retention of students, and faculty selection and development in professional education.

3. Fixing responsibility for program decision-making in professional education.

4. Identifying, developing, and utilizing appropriate resources for professional education.

5. Developing and maintaining appropriate linkages with other units, operations, groups, and offices within the institution and with schools, organizations, companies, and agencies outside the institution.

Finally, there must be evidence that the unit and its programs are periodically reviewed both internally and externally as are other similar units within the institution and that the results are used for planning and continued development of the unit and its programs.

The institution may choose the form and scope of the documentation it wishes to submit. In some instances, information provided on the Accreditation Application Report form may suffice. Here, however, are some suggested means of documentation for each of the preconditions.

Precondition	Suggested Documentation
#1	Unit statement of mission, purpose, or goals; description of allocation of authority for professional education

#2	Dean/director/chair's job description; unit administrative and organizational structure
#3	Unit's constitution and/or bylaws; codified policies and procedures of the unit
#4	Copies of working agreements; statements describing the official relationships between and among the unit and other units, etc.; policies governing relationships and institutions, organizations, agencies, groups, and offices outside the institution.
#5	Policies for review; summaries of recent reviews; copies of plans emanating from reviews; descriptions of refinements based on evaluations.
#6	Copy(ies) of the latest approval letter(s) from the State agency or agencies to show that State mandated standards have been met.
#7	A copy of the latest accreditation letter from the regional accreditation association to show there is reasonable assurance of the overall quality of the institution in the general areas of finance, administration, facilities, student personnel, faculty, and instruction.
#8	A copy of the institution's official action pledging compliance with non-discriminatory equal opportunity laws and policies.

Determination of eligibility

When the application materials reach the NCATE office, the professional staff will check them for completeness and do an analysis to determine if the preconditions do exist at the level stipulated by the Council. If they do so exist, the unit will be notified that it is eligible to be evaluated for NCATE accreditation and will receive materials and instructions for continuing the process.

If the preconditions do not exist at stipulated levels, the unit will be informed that it is not eligible for accreditation evaluation and the nature of the deficiency. It then may either discontinue its quest for NCATE accreditation or, within one year of submitting the original application, send documentation showing the deficiency has been corrected and the preconditions do now exist. If in the latter case the unit is now determined to be eligible for evaluation, it will be notified of that fact and sent the appropriate materials and instructions.

At each Council meeting that body will receive a report of all eligibility determinations made since their previous meeting. The report is for information purposes only.

Steps in application/eligibility/follow-up process

1. Unit sends letter of interest to NCATE office
2. Unit receives:

   a. Instructions for preparing application materials

   b. Accreditation Application Report form

   c. List of required preconditions

   d. Description of the steps in and usual timeline for the application/eligibility/evaluation/decision-making process

   e. Standards

   f. Information about usual accreditation costs, both initial and continuing.

   g. Annual List

3. Unit submits letter of application and accompanying materials
4. If eligible for evaluation, unit receives;

   1. Guide for preparing the Unit Report

   2. Standards (second copy)

   3. Suggestions for preparing for the team visit

   4. Guidelines for the composition, appointment, and functioning of the visiting team

   5. Visit Dates Preference form

   6. Initiation fee invoice

   If not eligible for evaluation, professional staff report of reasons goes to:

   1. Council (for information)

   2. Unit

5. If eligible for evaluation, unit submits initiation fee and Visit Dates Preference form

   If not eligible for evaluation,

   1. Unit submits documentation within the one-year period following original application to show deficiency has been corrected OR

   2. Discontinues quest for NCATE accreditation

6. If already eligible, unit receives:

1. Confirmation of dates for visit

2. Name and information about the proposed chair

If deficiency has been corrected, the process begins again with step 4.

If still not eligible for evaluation,

1. Unit submits documentation within the one-year period following original application to show deficiency has been corrected OR

2. Discontinues quest for NCATE accreditation

7. If eligible and step 6. has been completed, the process continues with the present NCATE procedure at that point.

If deficiency was corrected earlier, the process continues with the steps following step 4.

If deficiency has been newly corrected, the process picks up with step 4.

Date_____

NCATE
ACCREDITATION APPLICATION
REPORT

1. Institution_____

2. Mailing address_____

3. Chief administrative officer: Name_____Title_____

4. Administrator, professional education unit: Name_____Title_____

5. Person with whom all NCATE contacts should be made: Name_____

   Title_____

6. Institutional information
   a. Enrollment: Year_____

      Undergraduate: Full-time _____ Part-time_____

      Graduate: Full-time _____ Part-time_____

      Total: Full-time _____ Part-time_____

   b. Faculty: Year_____

      Full-time_____Part-time_____

   c. Statement of mission, philosophy, goals, or purpose

   d. Brief history

   e. Special characteristics

   f. Organization

   g. Accreditation and institutional memberships

7. Professional education unit information
   a. Enrollment: Year_____

      Undergraduate: Full-time_____ Part-time_____

      Graduate: Full-time_____ Part-time_____

      Total: Full-time_____ Part-time_____

   b. Faculty: Year_____

      Full-time_____ Part-time within the institution_____

   c. Statement of mission, purpose or goals

   d. Brief history

   e. Special characteristics

   f. Organization

APPENDIX B
Examples of Data Bank Elements Related to
Standards Quantification
(July 1, 1981 - June 30, 1982)

A. Professional Education Faculty (Associated with Basic Teacher Education Programs)

1. Total FTE (full-time appts. = 1.0; half-time = 0.5) _____

Number for whom their highest degree is:
doctorate _____
masters _____
bachelors _____
other _____

Average number of:

2. different preparations for a full-time faculty member per 9-mo. academic year _____

3. years of K-12 teaching experience _____

4. years since last year of at least half-time K-12 teaching _____

5. articles appearing in refereed journals, July to June of previous year _____

6. hours per week a full-time person spent in teaching classes _____

7. student teachers supervised for a full-time load _____

8. Average semester credit hours per FTE faculty associated with basic teacher education programs _____

9. Percent of courses taught by faculty with rank below assistant professor (e.g., instructor & graduate assistants) _____

10. In basic teacher eduation programs, ratio of FTE students to FTE faculty
(Use local definition of FTE students; please indicate your definition below, e.g., 15 undergraduate hours enrollment per semester = 1.0 student)

_____

_____

B. Students (Associated with Basic Teacher Education Programs)

1. Minimum GPA (A=4) required for admission to junior level of teacher education program _____

2. For students admitted to junior status July to June of previous year:
a. average GPA _____
b. average test scores of:
SAT-T _____
ACT-C _____
c. if available, median percentile rank in high school graduation class
NA _____

3. GPA required for admission to student teaching _____

4. Average cumulative GPA of students at time of admission to student teaching July to June of previous year _____

5. For graduating seniors, July to June of previous year, average score on NTE Commons Exam, if used _____
NA _____

6. If relevant, percent of July to June graduates passing state certification test _____
NA _____

7. Minimum GPA required for graduation _____

8. Average GPA of graduates, July to June of previous year _____

C. Resources (as applied to the entire school, college or department of education)

1. Expenditures for library materials, July to June of previous year:
institutional total $_____
professional education $_____

2. Expenditures for emerging technology:
July to June of previous year $_____
average of past 3 years $_____

3. Total unit hard money budget/FTE education students for July to June of previous year $_____

4. Expenditures for faculty development per FTE faculty:
July to June of previous year $_____
average of past 3 years $_____

5. What percent of your faculty have had sabbatical leaves during past past three years? _____

D. Experiental Component of TE Program

1. Hours students spend in school-based experiences prior to student teaching:
minimum required _____
average across all programs _____

2. Student teaching
a. number of weeks required, equated to full-time _____
b. minimum years of K-12 experience required for cooperating teachers _____
c. minimum years required in present position of cooperating teachers _____
d. is a course in supervising student teachers required? Yes _____
Yes (only if no prior supervisory experience) _____
No _____
e. percent of supervision by faculty with rank below assistant professor _____
f. minimum number of visits required for college supervisors _____